

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-4, 9, 10, and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Disclosed Prior Art in view of Taguchi et al. (US 5,745,089).

Claims 5-8 and 11-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Disclosed Prior Art in view of Taguchi et al. and Takeda et al. (US 4,651,148).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 3, 9, 15, and 17. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are pending for further consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-4, 9, 10, and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Disclosed Prior Art in view of Taguchi et al. (US 5,745,089), and claims 5-8 and 11-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Disclosed Prior Art in view of Taguchi et al. and Takeda et al. (US 4,651,148).

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as being based upon references that neither teach nor suggest each feature now recited in independent claims 1, 3, 9, 15, and 17.

Independent claims 1, 3, 9, 15, and 17, as amended, all recite a method of driving a liquid crystal display including the feature "wherein during the application of a scanning signal to a pre-stage gate line, a subsequent scanning signal is applied to a gate line."

In contrast to the Applicant's claimed invention, Taguchi et al. teaches, in FIG. 1, for example, a method of driving a liquid crystal display, wherein a first voltage Va2 and a second voltage Va1 are sequentially applied to a gate line such that the first voltage Va2 is applied to the

gate line after the second voltage V_{a1} is applied to a pre-stage gate line. In addition, Applicant's Disclosed Prior Art is completely silent with respect to application of a scanning signal to a pre-stage gate line and application of a subsequent scanning signal to a gate line. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Applicant's Disclosed Prior Art and Taguchi et al., whether taken singly or combined, fail to teach or suggest a method of driving a liquid crystal display, "wherein during the application of a scanning signal to a pre-stage gate line, a subsequent scanning signal is applied to a gate line," as recited by independent claims 1, 3, 9, 15, and 17, and hence dependent claims 2, 4-8, 10-14, 16, and 18-20.

As MPEP 2143.01 instructs, "[t]he mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990)." Accordingly, because the prior art does not teach or suggest any motivation to modify either Applicant's Disclosed Prior Art or Taguchi et al. to apply a subsequent scanning signal to a gate line during application of a scanning signal to a pre-stage gate line, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Office Action has not established any proper motivation to modify either Applicant's Disclosed Prior Art or Taguchi et al., and thus not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Applicant further asserts that the Office Action does not rely on Takeda et al. to remedy the deficiencies of Applicant's Disclosed Prior Art and/or Taguchi et al. Moreover, Applicant respectfully asserts that Takeda et al. cannot remedy the deficiencies of Applicant's Disclosed Prior Art and/or Taguchi et al.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 3, 9, 15, and 17 are neither taught nor suggested by Applicant's Disclosed Prior Art, Taguchi et

al., and/or Takeda et al., whether taken alone or in combination. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combination of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendments, reconsideration, and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.


If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS

Date: March 24, 2004

By: _____


David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Customer No. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004